IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 1 FOR THE DISTRICT OF PUERTO RICO 2 3 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, CASE NO. 17-CR-648 (FAB) 4) Plaintiff, 5 VS. SENTENCING HEARING 6 [1] ANGEL DE LA CRUZ, 7 Defendant. 8 9 TRANSCRIPT OF SENTENCING HEARING 10 HELD BEFORE THE HONORABLE JUDGE FRANCISCO A. BESOSA 11 SAN JUAN, PUERTO RICO Thursday, July 12, 2018 12 13 APPEARANCES: 14 15 For the United States: DAVID THOMAS HENEK, SAUSA United States Attorney's Office 16 Torre Chardón, Suite 1201 350 Carlos Chardón Street 17 San Juan, PR 00918 18 19 For the Defendant: YASMIN A. IRIZARRY, AFPD Federal Public Defender's Office 20 Patio Gallery Building 21 241 Franklin D. Roosevelt Ave. Hato Rey, PR 00918-2441 2.2 23 2.4 2.5 Produced by mechanical stenography; computer-aided transcription

(PROCEEDINGS COMMENCED AT 10:20 A.M.)

2

3

4

1

THE CLERK: Criminal Case No. 17-648, United States of America versus Angel De La Cruz for Sentencing Hearing.

5

On behalf of the Government, Assistant United States Attorney David Thomas Henek.

6 7

8

On behalf of the Defendant, Assistant Federal Public Defender Yasmin A. Irizarry.

9

Defendant is present and assisted by the certified court interpreter.

10 11

MR. HENEK: Good morning, Your Honor. David Henek on behalf of the Government. The Government is ready to proceed.

1314

15

16

12

MS. IRIZARRY: Good morning, Your Honor. Yasmin Irizarry on behalf of Mr. De La Cruz. And we are ready to proceed as well.

17

18

19

20

THE COURT: Ms. Irizarry, is there anything you would like to say on behalf of Mr. De La Cruz? And I have read your sentencing memorandum, which also includes objections to the pre-sentence investigation report.

21

MS. IRIZARRY: Yes, Your Honor.

2.2

23

As the Court then is aware, I have two objections to the pre-sentence investigation report, and I also have one request for a variance.

2.5

Before the Court probably indicates, I was able to

discuss with the Government, and we both agree that my client is eligible for a reduction pursuant to 2D1.1(b)(17). So we both agree that he is eligible for that two level reduction.

Your Honor, obviously, we do not waive the arguments that were represented by way of motion and that were moved by the Court in docket 56 as to if the Court is able to go under the 10-year mandatory minimum. So we make those arguments part of the record. We won't go into them.

Once again --

2.4

2.5

THE COURT: No, I understand.

What you are saying is that you are objecting to the fact that I decided that in this type of case, which is filed under Title 46, the safety valve is not applicable, but that the Defendant may qualify for a two level reduction under 2D1.1(b)(17). So that's the situation, except that the important thing about that is that, under the safety valve, I am allowed to sentence a defendant below the statutory minimum. Under 2D1.1(b)(17), I am not allowed to sentence a defendant below the statutory minimum. That's the difference.

So you retain that objection. I mean, it's on the record, anyway.

MS. IRIZARRY: Understood, Your Honor.

Then my second objection to the PSR would be,
Your Honor, that we understand that my client's participation

in the instant offense --

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

2.4

2.5

THE COURT: Well, let me ask, Mr. Henek.

You have no problem that Mr. De La Cruz qualifies under 2D1.1(b)(17)?

MR. HENEK: Correct, Your Honor. We would agree to a two point reduction. So the PSR should -- the parties have agreed that the PSR, the total offense level would be a level 33 instead of a level 35.

THE COURT: Thank you.

Your next objection, please.

MS. IRIZARRY: Yes, Your Honor.

We understand that his participation merits the two level reduction under 3B1.2(b) for minor roll, which also carries a four level additional adjustment under 2D1.1(a)(5), Your Honor. So we would like to argue as to that.

Your Honor, as the Court is aware, we have the burden to establish to the Court, by preponderance of the evidence, that he is eligible or entitled to that minor role adjustment. And the Court must make an individual assessment as to if in this particular case the Court understands that he is eligible for said adjustment.

For purposes of arguing that adjustment, we refer to our sentencing memorandum at docket 89, page 3, third paragraph, and page 4.

THE COURT: You even made the calculation in your

sentencing memorandum.

2.2

2.4

2.5

MS. IRIZARRY: Right now, yes. What I am talking about the arguments in favor --

THE COURT: I read it. But you made the calculation on page 5.

MS. IRIZARRY: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: That considering what you request, the total offense level would be 27 and that the guideline range would be 70 to 87 months, if I were to accept the minor role deduction and the -- the two minor role deductions. Although you -- well, it's not a safely valve, the 2D1.1(b)(17), which the Government agrees to.

MS. IRIZARRY: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Plus the three levels for acceptance of responsibility.

MS. IRIZARRY: And the two pages prior to that table that the Court is referencing to, basically, what I did in the sentencing memorandum is that I mirrored the list of factors that are mentioned in Application Notes 3(A) and (C) of 3B1.2. Basically, Your Honor, we understand that our client is a drug courier or a drug mule, which, considering his particular circumstances, the Court should grant the two level minor participant.

Your Honor, in this particular case, he was hired to transport some controlled substances. He was not in

charge of the vessel, of the trip, and much less played any role in the planning of the trip. There is a captain, which the Court has already sentenced to ten years of imprisonment. There is a first mate, which the Court has already sentenced to a 10-year imprisonment term.

2.2

2.4

2.5

THE COURT: I don't think there was any evidence of who was a captain and who was a first mate. I don't think in this case there was any evidence as to that, whether one of the three individuals was the captain or one was the first mate, or whether all three can be considered as captains because they took turns in steering the vessel. I don't think there was any evidence as to that.

So I didn't take into consideration in sentencing any of the others that anybody was a captain.

MS. IRIZARRY: Your Honor, I'm proffering to the Court that that was the rules that is consistent, I believe, with the information that the Government received through the three interviews of the three Defendants. So I am proffering to the Court that my client's role was neither the captain, nor the first mate. That he was basically just the muscle or the help. And in relation to the other two, his role was less.

Your Honor, he was going to be paid one shot for doing this trip. He had no propriety interest in the criminal activity. He just was hired to do a certain task.

His participation was very limited in nature and in extent. He was approached a couple days before leaving, and he was offered to be paid a certain amount of money for participating in the venture.

2.4

2.5

He had no discretion as to the fact -- the acts that he was ordered to do in the venture. He was not part of the inner circle in organizing any part, neither before, after, nor during the trip.

What he did was neither essential, nor dispensable. In fact, what he did could have been done by anyone.

We understand, as argued in the sentencing memorandum, that if we consider what he did in this case, in particular, in making assessment as to this case and his acts, that it merits the two level decrease for acceptance of -- sorry -- for minor role, plus the four level one that's included in the 2D1.1 guideline, Your Honor.

In contrast, I argue, Your Honor, this Court just sentenced a gentleman by the name of Harry Oyola-Lebron.

That man was charged in a multi-defendant, multi-kilo conspiracy; whereas, the Court noted for the record, there were firearms, and those firearms were used to kill people.

It was charged as a minimum -- mandatory minimum 10-year drug conspiracy; 10 to life.

Mr. Oyola-Lebron was allowed to plead guilty to less amount of drugs, hence 3.5 to 5 kilograms. So that

triggered the 5- to 40-year mandatory minimum, rather than the 10 year to life.

2.4

2.5

As the Court stated, in that case he had a leadership enhancement, he had a weapon enhancement, he had prior acts committed in the '90s that were violent priors with weapons. He had several arrests for different offenses, which did not result in any conviction. And in the particular case that the Court was sentencing him, he pled guilty to an agreement, which gave him the leadership role and also the firearm enhancement. That man was sentenced to 108 months of imprisonment.

Your Honor, in contrast, what we have here today is a first-time Defendant of 27 years old with no history whatsoever of controlled substance abuse. He was raised in a stable household, very poor, and he has a stable family because he has been — in the only relationship he has been in his life, which is with his wife, his wife of four years, common-law wife of eight years. They have two children, two small children.

My client's economic situation, which led to the participation of this offense, is that his mother, who was a pillar of society, who pushed him to enroll in college -- he finished his high school education. He was enrolled in college. He was working part-time. Fatima, his wife, was working part-time; she died.

When she died, she left behind his two siblings, sisters, who were minors at that time, and his oldest brother who suffers from polio. And all of them depended on his mother, who was also an artist and in sales in the artisan trade, Your Honor.

He had to abandon his studies so that he could support his family. His roof was falling in. He didn't have a medical plan for his siblings. His wife had a condition which required surgery. He didn't have a vehicle to transport his family. And that's when he was approached with the participation in the instant offense.

Everybody knows who his mother was. Everybody knows that this honest family was -- what they were suffering, and somebody took advantage and offered him a way out.

He had been three years trying to support this family, this extended family, but not being able to. And that's why he participated in the instant offense.

Your Honor, in contrast, there is no way that it could be reasonable for this man to receive a 120-month sentence or 135, which is the lower end of the applicable guideline range, when you have by contrast this other person who has just been sentenced to 108 months, Your Honor.

This is --

2.0

2.4

THE COURT: But that person was sentenced under

different statutes. 1 MS. IRIZARRY: Exactly, Your Honor. 2 3 THE COURT: So you can't compare apples and 4 oranges. 5 MS. IRIZARRY: Nevertheless, we can compare as to roles, Your Honor. We can compare as to mitigating factors, 6 7 Your Honor, for this Court to consider a variant sentence. 8 We know the Court's ruling, that the Court believes 9 that you cannot go under the 120 months. 10 Obviously, our request is 70 months, but we respect 11 the Court's ruling. But in no way can it be reasonable for 12 this person to receive a sentence of above 120 months, 13 Your Honor. 14 Also, we would like the Court --15 THE COURT: Okay. So that's your request? Your 16 request is 120 months. 17 MS. IRIZARRY: No. My request is 70 months, Your Honor. But we respect -- we know how the Court feels as 18 19 to that it cannot go under the 120 months. 2.0 THE COURT: Okay. MS. IRIZARRY: Your Honor, we also ask for the 2.1 2.2 Court to rule on our -- on the facts of this particular case 23 in relation to the minor role that we are requesting. THE COURT: Thank you. 2.4 2.5 Mr. Henek, what is your position on the minor role?

MR. HENEK: Good morning, Your Honor.

2.2

2.4

2.5

Your Honor, the Government opposes any application of minor role, and on this basis, Your Honor:

The facts are very simple in this case. The Defendant was -- Mr. De La Cruz was found on a boat with two other individuals transporting over 1,300 kilograms of cocaine, Your Honor. That is approximately \$26 million of cocaine at current prices in Puerto Rico.

The Defendant has failed to meet their burden of proving any minor role reduction. The First Circuit has held on numerous occasions that the role of a courier does not automatically entitle one to a reduction.

Similarly, Defense Counsel's arguing or trying to argue that Mr. De La Cruz performed some type of menial task. Again, the First Circuit has denied a minor role adjustment where the Defendant has performed only menial tasks, such as unloading drugs and conducting surveillance.

For the record, that's *United States v.*Ortiz-Santiago 211 F.3d 146.

In addition, Your Honor, one particular case is instructive with respect to minor role adjustment in boats and narcotics trafficking. That's $U.S.\ v.\ Perez\ 819\ F.3d$ 541.

In that case, the First Circuit upheld the District Court's denial of a minor role application where two

defendants were found onboard of a vessel with approximately a thousand kilos of cocaine. Here we have more than that. We have 1,325 kilos.

2.4

2.5

Finally, Your Honor, with respect to the minor role reduction, quantity is relevant in determining whether or not a minor role application is warranted. And on numerous occasions, Courts have held that a far — a substantially less amount, in fact, under 100 kilograms of cocaine, does not qualify for minor role. So I will just cite one or two cases.

In the First Circuit, *U.S. v. Vargas* 560 F.3d 45, there the denial of a mitigating role adjustment was affirmed when the amount was only 30 kilograms of cocaine.

And I will cite a Ninth Circuit case, U.S. v.

Rodriguez-Castro 641 F.3d 1189. That, a denial of a

mitigating role was denied in a case only involving

33.46 kilograms of cocaine, which the Court considered was a substantial amount. Therefore, denying the mitigation role.

So, on the facts of this case, Your Honor, we would disagree with any application of a minor role based on quantity, as well as the role that this -- Mr. De La Cruz was one of three people actively transporting 1,300 kilos of cocaine towards Puerto Rico.

Accordingly, we also agree with the Court's determination that the safety valve does not apply in this

case. Therefore, with a total offense level of 33, the United States would request a sentence at the lower end of the guideline range of 135 months, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Mr. De La Cruz, is there anything you would like to say?

DEFENDANT DE LA CRUZ: Yes, sir.

2.2

2.4

2.5

THE COURT: Before you start --

Ms. Irizarry, I am going to deny your request for a minor role, basically, for the reasons stated by the Government; number one, he was entrusted with 1,325 kilos, approximately \$26 million worth of cocaine, and certainly that trust, plus the amount of cocaine involved, does not warrant a minor role reduction.

So, Mr. De La Cruz, what is it that you want to say?

DEFENDANT DE LA CRUZ: I want to apologize, and I want to ask for forgiveness to the Government of the United States and to Puerto Rico and each one of the citizens present here.

You can imagine what my situation is, a young 23-year-old whose mother passes away, left in charge of her siblings, having to meet all their needs. And this is the situation I suffered for five years, barely being able to support the family. I was in a very sad and critical state of affairs, financially speaking.

As my attorney explained, that whole situation led me to commit this offense of which I am very repentant. I promise that this time that I will be incarcerated, I will try to work in something that will benefit me.

2.4

2.5

In general, what I really want is to find my family well again and to be able to return in time to help them out, because I know they need me during this time.

That's all. Thank you very much, sir.

THE COURT: On March 26, 2018, Defendant Angel

De La Cruz pled guilty to all three counts of the indictment
pursuant to a straight plea in Criminal Case No. 17-648,
which charges violations of Title 46, United States Code
sections 70503 and 70506; Title 21, United States Code
section 952; and Title 18, United States Code section 2,
conspiracy to possess, possession with intent to distribute,
and conspiracy to import approximately 1,325 kilograms of
cocaine onboard a vessel subject to the jurisdiction of the
United States, and aiding and abetting others to do that; all
are class A felonies.

The November 1st 2016 Edition of the Sentencing Guidelines Manual has been used to calculate the guideline adjustments pursuant to the provisions of guideline section 1B1.11(a) because the Commission did not promulgate any amendments that would become effective on November 1, 2017.

Counts One through Three were grouped together because the offense level is determined on the basis of the quantity of the substance involved pursuant to guideline section 3D1.2(d).

2.1

2.2

2.4

2.5

Based on the provisions of guideline section 2D1.1(c)(1), a base offense level of 38 has been determined because Mr. De La Cruz has been convicted of conspiracy to possess with intent to distribute and importing into the United States at least 450 kilograms of cocaine, a total of 1,325 kilograms.

Because Mr. De La Cruz complied with the provisions of sentencing guideline section 2D1.1(b)(17), the base offense level is reduced by two levels.

Because Mr. De La Cruz timely accepted responsibility for his offenses, however, the offense level is reduced by three more levels pursuant to guideline sections 3E1.1(a) and 3E1.1(b).

There are no other applicable guideline adjustments.

His total offense level is 33.

Because Mr. De La Cruz has no previous convictions, no criminal history points resulted, which places him in Criminal History Category I.

Based on a total offense level of 33 and a Criminal History Category of I, the guideline imprisonment range for

Mr. De La Cruz's offenses is from 135 to 168 months.

2.0

2.2

2.4

2.5

There is a fine range of \$35,000 to \$10 million, plus a supervised release term of at least five years.

The probation officer has correctly applied the guideline computations, and the pre-sentence investigation report satisfactorily reflects the components of Mr. De La Cruz's offenses by considering their nature and circumstances.

The Court has also considered the other sentencing factors set forth in Title 18, United States Code section 3553(a).

Mr. De La Cruz is a 27-year-old Dominican national who has the equivalent of a high school education. He has been a self-employed fisherman all of his life.

He has no known history of using controlled substance or of using alcohol to excess, and has no history of mental health issues.

The Court will exercise its discretion and impose a variant sentence, taking into consideration factors related to the offense and Mr. De La Cruz. Mr. De La Cruz is an undocumented person with no prior criminal record who is subject to removal proceedings pursuant to the immigration laws.

A sentence at the statutory minimum is a sentence which is sufficient but not greater than necessary to reflect

the seriousness of the offense, promote respect for the law, provide just punishment -- and provide just punishment for the offense.

2.2

2.4

2.5

Accordingly, it's the judgment of the Court that that Angel De La Cruz is committed to the custody of the Bureau of Prisons to be imprisoned for a term of 120 months as to each count of conviction, to be served concurrently with each other.

Upon release from confinement, Mr. De La Cruz shall be placed on supervised release for a term of five years as to each count of conviction, to be served concurrently with each other, under the following terms and conditions:

He shall observe the standard conditions of supervised release recommended by the United States Sentencing Commission and adopted by this Court.

He shall not commit another Federal, State, or local crime.

He shall not possess firearms, destructive devices, or other dangerous weapons.

He shall not possess controlled substances unlawfully.

If deported or granted voluntary departure,

Mr. De La Cruz shall remain outside the United States and all

places subject to its jurisdiction, unless prior written

permission to reenter is obtained from the pertinent legal

authorities and he notifies the probation officer of the permission in writing.

2.4

2.5

He shall cooperate in the collection of a DNA sample as directed by the probation officer pursuant to the revised DNA collection requirements and Title 18, United States Code section 3563(a)(9).

Having considered Mr. De La Cruz's financial condition, a fine is not imposed.

A special monetary assessment in the amount of \$100 per count, for a total of \$300, is imposed, however, as required by law.

Mr. De La Cruz, you have a right to appeal your conviction and your sentence.

A notice of appeal must be filed in this court within 14 days from when the judgment of the Court will be entered.

You have a right to apply for leave to appeal in forma pauperis if you are unable to pay the cost of an appeal.

Because you are represented by court-appointed counsel, she will continue to represent you through any appeal, unless a substitute counsel is later appointed.

Is there anything else?

MS. IRIZARRY: Yes, Your Honor.

We request that he be sent to serve his sentence in

a place where he can learn English as a Second Language. He already has a high school degree. So we also request that he be allowed to continue his studies, in particular English as a Second Language.

2.0

2.4

2.5

He is also requesting that, if possible, the Court recommend that he be sent to serve his sentence in Fort Dix, or -- he is mentioning Mochannon Valley. I am not sure if the Court is aware of where this is, but I can inform -- I can file a small informative motion when I get back to my office to try to clear up -- he says it's in the State of Georgia. So I will file -- when I get back to the office, I'll file it.

Yes, Your Honor. That's our request.

And, also, Your Honor, we would like the record to reflect that we understand that the sentence has been substantially and procedurally unreasonable for the reasons we have stated on the record.

THE COURT: I will recommend that Mr. De La Cruz be designated either to Fort Dix or that other place in Georgia, where you will inform me; that he take courses in English as a Second Language; and that he participate in any vocational training that may be afforded at the institution in which he may be interested.

MS. IRIZARRY: Or degree, since he has his --

THE COURT: Pardon?

MS. IRIZARRY: Or any degree, because he has --THE COURT: Well, if there are college level courses that he may take, then that also. MS. IRIZARRY: Thank you, Your Honor. THE COURT: I bet it's more -- there is more of a chance that there will be English as a Second Language courses in Fort Dix than in Georgia, really, but we will find out. Thank you. You are excused. MS. IRIZARRY: Thank you, Your Honor. MR. HENEK: Thank you, Your Honor. (PROCEEDINGS ADJOURNED AT 10:50 A.M.)

REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE

I, JOE REYNOSA, Official Court Reporter for the United States District Court for the District of Puerto Rico, appointed pursuant to the provisions of Title 28, United States Code, Section 753, do hereby certify that the foregoing is a true and correct computer-aided transcript of proceedings had in the within-entitled and numbered cause on the date herein set forth; and I do further certify that the foregoing transcript has been prepared by me or under my

direction.

S/Joe Reynosa

JOE REYNOSA, CSR, RPR

United States Court Reporter Federico Degetau Federal Building, Room 150 150 Carlos Chardón Street San Juan, Puerto Rico 00918-176 (787) 772-3000